

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Claims 2-37 are pending. Claims 10-21 and 29-37 have been restricted out.

In this action, the Examiner objected to claim 24 for an informality. In response, applicant has corrected the informality. Applicant therefore requests that the objection to claim 24 as amended be withdrawn.

Applicant has also taken this opportunity to correct a typographical error in claim 37 and in the specification.

The Examiner rejected claims 2-9 and 22-28 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over U.S. patent no. 5,519,861 (Ryu et al.) This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Both the invention and Ryu et al. happen to work with time-series data. Ryu et al. receive and store time-series data in a vertical file and then convert the data from the vertical file into a horizontal file. In the horizontal file, the data is recorded and stored in a sequence that corresponds to the order in which a user wants to have the data displayed. In contrast, the claimed invention stores the data of each time series in a corresponding register, and evaluates each of one or more queries against the registers to find data that match the query or queries. So, other than storing and working with time-series data, the claimed invention and Ryu et al. have substantially nothing in common with each other.

Initially, applicant notes that the Examiner has not even attempted to show that every element of applicants' claims is found in Ryu et al. Rather, the Examiner has merely referenced the same set of passages of Ryu et al. over and over for each and every claim element, without bothering to establish any specific correspondence between particular structures or functions disclosed by Ryu et al. and individual means and steps of applicants' claims. What the Examiner is in essence saying is "I think it's in here someplace; you figure it out." This is inadequate to show anticipation. It is incumbent upon the Examiner to identify wherein each and every facet of the claimed invention is disclosed in the applied

reference. Ex parte Levy, 17 USPQ 2d 1461, 1462 (Bd. Pat. App. 1990). Moreover, the Examiner could not make the requisite showing even if he tried, for the simple reason that Ryu et al. in fact do not disclose each and every element of applicants' claims.

Considering the specific recitations of the claims, claim 4 recites "means for receiving query strings representing queries," and claim 22 has similar functional recitations. Ryu et al. receive user requests for display formats, but they do not receive query strings. Claim 4 recites "means for compiling the received query strings into persistent queries", and claim 22 has similar functional recitations. Ryu et al. do not disclose, teach, or suggest any such compiling element or function. Claim 4 recites "at least one said persistent query, each defining a query represented by received said query strings," and claim 22 has similar functional recitations. Ryu et al. do not disclose, teach, or suggest any element corresponding to a persistent query defining a query represented by a query string. Claim 4 recites "means responsive to storing of a received data point in a trigger register, for evaluating each persistent query corresponding to the trigger register," and claim 22 has similar functional recitations. Ryu et al. have no corresponding element or function; Ryu et al. do not do any of their reordering in response to storing of a received data point in a register/file. Finally, claim 4 recites "means for outputting a payload of each evaluated persistent query whose event condition has a first value," and claim 22 has similar functional recitations. Ryu et al. have no corresponding element or function; assuming that displaying data in a particular format in Ryu et al. corresponds to outputting a payload, it is not dependent on a persistent query event condition having a particular value.

A like analysis applies to the dependent claims as well.

Applicants have pointed out specific recitations of their claims that distinguish the claimed invention from the disclosure of Ryu et al. Applicants have thus proven that Ryu et al. do not anticipate their claims.

Applicants therefore request that the Section 102(b) rejection of their claims based on Ryu et al. be withdrawn.

The Examiner's objection and rejection having been properly addressed and disposed of, applicants assert that the application is now in condition for allowance. Applicants therefore request that the application be reconsidered and thereafter be passed to issue.

Applicants believe the foregoing to be dispositive of all issues in the application. But, if the Examiner should deem that a telephone interview would advance prosecution, then applicants request the Examiner to call their attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

**Eric T. Bax**  
**Joseph G. Billock**  
**Ian D. Swett**

By   
David Volejnicek  
Corporate Counsel  
Reg. No. 29355  
303-538-4154

Date: 25 Feb. 2008

Avaya Inc.  
Docket Administrator  
307 Middletown-Lincroft Road  
Room 1N-391  
Lincroft, NJ 07738